

25th March 2019

A Meeting was held at Horsham Police Station to discuss a number of concerns held by Sussex Police regarding the management of Déjà Vu. The meeting was attended by PC CJ903 Jones and Pauline Giddings, Divisional Licensing Officer, of the Neighbourhood Licensing Team and Mr. Samaroo the DPS and PLH of the premises. Mr. Samaroo agreed that an inordinate amount of police time had been spent endeavouring to secure CCTV footage from the premises.

Jones Warren CJ903

From: Jones Warren CJ903
Sent: 25 March 2019 19:09
To: 'Deja-Vu-bar'
Cc: WS_Licensing_WOR; Lyons, Michael
Subject: Meeting summary
Attachments: Deja Vu meeting summary 25032019.pdf

Good evening Noel,

Please find attached, a summary of today's meeting.

If you have any questions over the content, please do not hesitate to contact myself or Pauline Giddings, otherwise I look forward to receiving your response.

Regards,

Warren



Warren Jones

Constable CJ903

Prevention Licensing Team | West Sussex Police

Hurst Road | Horsham | RH12 2DJ

Tel No: 101 ext 530353 | Mobile: 07780 227415

warren.jones@sussex.pnn.police.uk



Sussex Police
Serving Sussex

www.sussex.police.uk

Neighbourhood Licensing Team

Déjà Vu Clubs Ltd

Southgate

Crawley

25th March 2019

Dear Mr Samaroo,

Déjà Vu Bar 26 High Street Crawley RH10 1BW

Thank you for attending Horsham Police Station today for a meeting with PC CJ903 Jones and Pauline Giddings, Divisional Licensing Officer, of the Neighbourhood Licensing Team.

The meeting was sought to discuss a number of concerns pertaining to the premises Déjà vu; for which you are both the Premises Licence Holder (PLH) and the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS). Following introductions you were asked if you knew why the meeting was called. You stated that you knew that the problem around the CCTV had been poorly handled but that a new system would prevent this recurring and that staff had been spoken to about it.

It was agreed that the CCTV problem had wasted an inordinate amount of Sussex Police's time. You stated that the person you thought was capable of handling the CCTV system clearly was not able to do so. You said that your head door supervisor was better equipped and would be handling this in future. You also stated that your sister was taking her BII exam and would be applying for a personal licence. She would then assume the role of General Manager.

You were reminded that it is a condition of the premises licence, at **Annex 2 condition (2)**:

- *Digital CCTV and appropriate recording equipment to be installed in accordance with Home Office Guidelines relating to UK Police Requirements for Digital CCTV System (PSDB Publication Number 09/05), operated and maintained throughout the premises internally and externally to cover all public areas, including the entrance to the premises. The system shall be on and recording at all times the premises licence is in operation.*
 - *The CCTV cameras and recording equipment must be of sufficient quality to work in all lighting levels inside the premises at all times.*
 - *CCTV footage will be stored for a minimum of 31 days*
 - *The management will give full and immediate cooperation and technical assistance to the Police in the event that CCTV footage is required for the prevention and detection of suspected or alleged crime.*
 - *The CCTV images will record and display dates and times, and these times will be checked regularly to ensure their accuracy.*
 - *Subject to Data Protection guidance and legislation, the management of the premises will ensure that key staff are fully trained in the operation of the CCTV, and will be able to download selected footage onto a disk for the police without difficulty or delay and without charge to Sussex Police.*

Sussex Police

Telephone: 01273 404030

Centenary House, Durrington Lane, Worthing, West
Sussex, BN13 2PQ

You went on to say that you were aware of the three girls who had been readmitted after 01:00 hours on the 6th January but that they had been in the premises earlier; they had then been served drinks but had gone out to get money to pay for them. This had been recorded by the door supervisor who let them back in. You also explained that you had looked at CCTV and had not seen any evidence of a male being allowed to enter from the rear of the premises after 01:00 hours on the 12th January.

As you are aware entry or re-entry to the premises is restricted by the condition attached to the premises licence which clearly states at **Annex 2 condition (9)**:

No customers are permitted entry or re-entry to the premises after 01:00 save for smokers using the designated smoking area.

[The detailed history behind these incidents is reproduced below for convenience*].

At this point PC Jones indicated that it would be useful to view the CCTV footage.

The CCTV of the 6th January clearly shows the three females entering the premises after 01:00 hours. No challenge is made as they pass a number of door supervisors. They later leave the premises and again return unchallenged. You stated that this was to pay for their drinks however the females twice entered the premises after 01:00 hours; it was explained the condition attached to the licence does not provide discretionary exceptions.

Having viewed the CCTV footage of 12th January 2019; where a well built and easily noticeable male clearly gained access via the rear of the premises, you were incredulous. You admitted you had not examined the CCTV but had trusted the word of your head door supervisor who had told you he had checked it. Having been adamant that nobody had gained entry via the fire exit, you were clearly disappointed to see that, not only was this not the case, but that a number of staff members were present when he had. The male and his female companion having been refused entry via the front of the club, were welcomed by a variety of persons having some minutes later managed to gain entry. PC Jones confirmed that two of your staff, including your head door supervisor had told him on the night that the male was a staff member. You stated this was not the case.

You identified four members of door staff on duty at the premises, saying that you employed a lot of door supervisors for a small premises. It was agreed that it was not the quantity that was the issue. You also asserted that the male who had allowed access through the fire exit could not be allowed to stay in your employment, particularly as his efforts at producing the CCTV footage had reflected so badly on the management of the club. It was suggested to you however, that Sussex Police believed the accounts of these incidents, as given by differing staff members, to both you and to the police, were clearly inaccurate. It was considered highly improbable that in a premises the size of Déjà Vu, a well-built male entering the premises would go unnoticed by all the SIA trained door supervisors. The fact that attempts made by a police officer to obtain the CCTV footage were impeded by various staff members was also a matter of concern. You reiterated that you were shocked that your head doorman had told you no incident had occurred where a person had gained entry. PC Jones stated that, it would seem the staff have all let you down.

Discussion followed and it was suggested that Body Worn Video cameras should be worn by all SIA door staff employed at the entrance of the premises and that this should be a condition attached to the premises licence. This would ensure footage was available and would provide a record of any verbal exchange taking place. It was also discussed that SIA door supervisors were still difficult to identify as they were not wearing any identifying/Hi-Viz. You said they did while outside but you would ensure they did inside also.

It was clear that you understood the seriousness of the situation. All stages of a stepped approach had now been taken to engage and work with you the premises licence holder to ensure the licensing objectives are promoted.

You were reminded that as the Premises Licence Holder and Designated Premises Supervisor you are responsible for the lawful conduct of this premises and for ensuring it is run in accordance both with the premises licence and with the Licensing Act 2003.

Further breaches of the conditions of your premises licence may result in legal action without further notice; this may place the premises licence at risk.

Sussex Police take this opportunity to remind you that it is a criminal offence under the Licensing Act 2003 to carry on licensable activity from any premises in breach of the conditions of the licence. The maximum penalty on conviction is six months imprisonment and/or an unlimited fine.

Please respond in writing to this office, within 7 days of the date on this letter, confirming what steps you have put in place and what ongoing actions you are taking to rectify the issues raised.

If you wish to discuss or do not understand any part of this letter please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Sincerely,



Warren Jones
Police Constable CJ903

West Sussex Neighbourhood Licensing Team
Police station hurst Raod Horsham West Sussex RH12 2DJ
Tel 101 x 530353
Warren.jones@sussex.pnn.police.uk
WS_Licensing_WOR@sussex.pnn.police.uk

.....

History of events surrounding 6th & 12th January 2019

*On **6th January 2019 at 01:29 hours** PC Jones witnessed three females running along Crawley High Street. At 01:45 PC Jones conducted a licensing visit to Déjà vu and noted that the three females were inside the premises. As you are aware the premises has a condition attached to the licence which clearly states at Annex 2 condition (9):

No customers are permitted entry or re-entry to the premises after 01:00 save for smokers using the designated smoking area.

This breach was pointed out to "Brandon", who you have stated was your general manager at the time, and the CCTV requested. PC Jones was told this was not possible however, he informed the staff he would return at 03:00 to collect it. On his return at 03:00 hours you had attended the premises and a DVD of the footage was handed to PC Jones. On inspection it transpired this was not footage from the CCTV system but a copy of a mobile phone download recorded at double speed. You were emailed advising of this failing.

On **12th January 2019 at 01:18 hours** PC Jones was on duty in uniform in Crawley High Street and witnessed a well-built male wearing distinctive clothing approaching with a female. They appeared to be refused entry to your premises and continued around the corner. At 01:58 hours PC Jones entered the premises where by he identified the same male and female inside the premises. A request was made for CCTV for all entrances including the fire escape at the rear of the premises for the period of time in question. As the DPS was not present the request was made via the head door supervisor regarding this breach of the premises licence.

On **12th January 2019** PC Jones visited Déjà vu to collect the CCTV footage for both 6th and 12th January 2019. The CCTV for 6th would not play and no footage was provided for 12th January 2019.

On **13th January 2019** PC Jones again visited Déjà vu to collect the CCTV footage for both 6th and 12th January 2019. Again despite assurances to the contrary, the CCTV for 6th would not play and again it contained no footage for 12th January 2019.

On **14th January 2019 at 20:00 hours** PC Jones attended Déjà vu to collect the CCTV footage for both 6th and 12th January 2019. The member of staff dealing with this stated he had just awoken so had not yet addressed the problem. PC Jones returned to the premises an hour later. The DPS MR Samaroo was present and provided a USB stick which apparently held the required data. PC Jones asked for this to be checked prior to him leaving the premises. No video files were present on the stick. PC Jones informed Mr Samaroo that if this was not provided by the time the next police officer visited a Closure Notice under Section 19 of Criminal Justice & Police Act 2001 would be issued. Assurances were given that it would be ready by 22:00 hours that day. At 23:25 hours the premises were visited and footage was still being downloaded. An evidence bag was provided for it to be delivered to the Police Station.

18th January 2019 PC Jones checked the footage provided. While some cameras had been downloaded none of those covering the rear or the outside of the premises had been provided.

29th January 2019 Mr Samaroo emailed re the missing CCTV. A reply was received asking for all USB sticks to be returned. PC Jones confirmed these had previously been returned and that the one outstanding would be returned the following day.

30th January 2019 a member of staff from the premises informed PC Jones that it would take 11 hours to download the requested footage. At 22:39 hours PC Jones received a message requesting the original footage so that it could be converted. He was informed that all the footage had been returned to the premises. Mr Samaroo later called to say that an engineer would be called out and requested PC Jones be present at 3pm the following afternoon. As PC would not be on duty this was not possible however he agreed to attend in the evening to collect the footage.

1st February 2019 Mr Samaroo emailed PC Jones apologising for the "inept way that the CCTV was provided" It was explained that the system was old and was to be replaced. It also explained that the remaining footage could not now be provided as it had been over written.

Jones Warren CJ903

From: Noel Samaroo <[REDACTED]@uk>
Sent: 28 March 2019 15:45
To: Jones Warren CJ903
Subject: RE: Meeting summary
Attachments: image001.png

Dear Warren,

I would like to say it was a pleasure to meet with yourself and Pauline at Horsham Police Station to discuss the concerns you had regarding Deja Vu.

However it turned out to be an incredibly uncomfortable and embarrassing meeting to say the least.

I have taken on board all that was discussed along with the requests and suggestions made at the meeting to ensure that these events NEVER happen again.

The following steps have been taken:

- The member of staff that was so inept with the CCTV I now think intentionally to try and cover his tracks and lied about the events surrounding the entry through the fire escape has been dismissed with immediate effect.
- New Hi Viz has been ordered and delivered and will be worn by all door supervisors.
- An additional body worn cam has been ordered and will be worn by door supervisors whilst on duty at the front door.
- The CCTV system is in the process of being upgraded to a digital system.
- A meeting has been called with door security team where their shortfalls will be identified and a final warning to all of them will be given.

I am sure that the appropriate steps have been taken to ensure that these breaches do not happen again and would like to thank you for your proportionate response.

Kind regards
Noel

Noel A Samaroo

Deja Vu Clubs Ltd
Managing Director (MIoL)

☐ 07 [REDACTED]
✉ [REDACTED]
🌐 [REDACTED]
📍 26-30 High St, Crawley RH10 1BW



On 5th May 2019 at 01:26hrs Sub-Judice

On 5th May 2019 at 01:26 hrs police officers received a report from member of the public that a male had been assaulted and was unconscious on the floor outside Deja Vu. The male (1) had been inside the premises and, having been asked to leave, was then assaulted outside the club. A second male (2) also sustained some injuries apparently while trying to assist Male (1). Both victims were transported to New East Surrey Hospital. A number of staff from the premises were arrested.

The matter remains Sub-Judice.

16th May 2019

Sussex Police received a Late Temporary Event Notice in relation to Déjà vu. It gave notice of the intention to extend the permitted hours for the sale of alcohol (on and off sales) by one hour from 02:00 to 03:00 for three nights over the late May bank holiday weekend, (25th-27th May 2019), also to increase the capacity of the smoking area. Due to the ongoing investigation into the assault of 5th May Sussex Police raised an objection to the Notice under S104 (2) of the Licensing Act 2003. Mr. Samaroo subsequently withdrew the Notice.



Sussex Police
Serving Sussex

www.sussex.police.uk

West Sussex Division

Neighbourhood Licensing Team

West Sussex Licensing Team
Centenary House
Durrington Lane
Worthing
West Sussex
BN13 2PQ

Tel: 01273 404 030

Email: WS_Licensing_WOR@sussex.pnn.police.uk

16th May 2019

Mr Mike Lyons
Alcohol & Premises Licensing
Planning & Environmental Services Dept
Town Hall
The Boulevard
CRAWLEY
RH10 1UZ

Dear Mr Jones,

RE: LATE TEMPORARY EVENT NOTICE FOR DEJA-VUE-BAR. 26 – 30 HIGH STREET, CRAWLEY, WEST SUSSEX, RH10 1BW FOR 25TH- 27TH MAY 2019.

NOTICE OF OBJECTION UNDER SECTION 104 (2) OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003

Notice of objection is hereby given on behalf of the Chief Officer of Police for Sussex for the above Temporary Event Notice (TEN) on the grounds of the prevention of crime and disorder and public safety.

The TEN advises the notice givers' intention to extend the permitted hours for the sale of alcohol (both on and off sales) by one hour from 02:00 to 03:00 for three nights over the late May bank holiday weekend, and to increase the capacity of the smoking area.

Sussex Police are currently investigating a serious incident connected to this premises where by a member of the public was the subject of an assault sustaining injuries requiring hospital

treatment. This raises concerns for Sussex Police relating to crime and disorder and it is therefore considered necessary in interests of public safety to object to this Notice

The Chief Officer of Police contends that permitting the premises to be used in accordance with the notice is likely to lead to crime and disorder and a risk to public safety. We therefore ask that a Counter Notice is issued by the Licensing Authority Committee.

I confirm that a copy of this objection letter has been sent by email to the applicant and every other 'relevant person'.

Yours sincerely,



Rosemary Ross
District Commander

cc: Premises Licence Holder: Mr Noel Samaroo
Déjà Vu Clubs Limited
[Redacted]
Crawley
West Sussex
[Redacted]

6th June 2019 23:30 hours

On Wednesday 6th June at approximately 23:30 hours police officers were called by staff at Deja Vu requesting assistance. Members of staff had detained a male who had been into their stock room and had stolen a bottle of Jack Daniels spirit. The male had been stopped by staff just outside the storeroom door with the one item in his possession. However when the police officers attended they were merely asked to escort the male from the premises, stating that they were not willing to support further action.

Having witnessed the theft, and called for police officers to attend, the staff refused to support any further action; failing to promote the licensing objective of the prevention of crime and disorder.

Please note this should read 5th June not 6th June

[Redacted] (when complete)

WITNESS STATEMENT

Criminal Procedure Rules, r 16.2; Criminal Justice Act 1967, s.9

URN [] [] [] []

Statement of: PC DART CD972

Age if under 18: OVER 18 (if over 18 insert 'over 18')

Occupation: Police Constable CD972

This statement (consisting of 2 page(s) each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it, anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Signature: [Redacted] CD972

Date 20/08/2019

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded [] (supply witness details on rear)

On Wednesday 05th JUNE 2019 I was on full uniformed duty operating out of CRAWLEY POLICE STATION in WEST SUSSEX. I was crewed with PC WIGGLESWORTH DW112 and both officers were using the call sign WR109.

During the course of my duty I have attended a 999 call to DÉJÀ VU which is a bar in CRAWLEY HIGH STREET. The reports were a male had been stopped and detained as the staff stated he had stolen a bottle of drink. On arrival I as greeted with the manager who stated a male had been stopped for taking a bottle, kicked off and was put to the floor. The male stated he had not been non-compliant and was thrown to the floor, the area where the altercation happened and was very small. Albeit the male had already been stopped and detained and in such a small area I am unsure as to why he was thrown and pinned down on the floor. Everybody was calm and awaiting police arrival but there had been further 999 calls chasing attendance.

The staff had already got the bottle back and wanted the male removed and not to return. As always it was very quick on arrival and nobody was willing to remain and come away from the main area to help assist with police investigations. As it was a Monday night there was no door supervision, however the usual door staff that can be obstructive when police arrive happened to be close by and had managed to put the male to the floor. As the suspect was present his details were obtained and a section one search of PACE was completed. There was nothing further found on his person or his bag. Everywhere was easily accessible due to a lack of signs on the doors. Given it stated the male was kicking off and males arrived to detain him did not identify themselves as door staff or have anything identifying themselves as security. Due to nothing further being located the male was released out the front of the bar and let on his way. Another crime and file niche was created.

There are many incidents where police are called to DÉJÀ VU and turned away on arrival with lack of support. When called to a disturbance or fight as such on a weekend the staff are keen to chase police arrival but on arriving the manager is often outside to greet officers and say everything is calm and is happy to keep those responsible inside. There are often further issues with the same group but the manger is again happy to keep them inside.

The door staff are often very heavy handed and never wear any hi visibility clothing identifying themselves outside. This is an issue often raised but as of yet has not changed. The door staff are

Signature: [Redacted] CD972

Signature witnessed by:

[Redacted] (when complete)

very obstructive on attending a licensing check at the premises and often halt officers at the door. On this particular incident has no identity on them and pinned the male to the floor. There are many reports of the manager on duty allowing underage males and female in, some are even his friends. This is always a hush hush set up with those involved making sure they have no messages from him to prove he has allowed them in. [Redacted]

[Lined area for notes or additional text]

15th June 2019 23:31 hours

Sussex Police received a call from staff requesting assistance due to a group of eight males inside the premises abusing staff. They were reported as being highly intoxicated and becoming "more and more agitated". Staff raised concerns to the police that they believed a fight was about to erupt.

At approximately 23:40 hours, the premises staff then cancelled the request for police assistance, having decided to let the males remain on the premises.

(when complete)

WITNESS STATEMENT**Criminal Procedure Rules, r 16.2; Criminal Justice Act 1967, s.9**

URN

--	--	--	--

Statement of: PC ANDREW BRYANT

Age if under 18: OVER (if over 18 insert 'over 18') Occupation: POLICE OFFICER
18

This statement (consisting of 1 page(s) each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated anything in it, which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Signature: [REDACTED] CB177

Date 07/08/2019

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded (supply witness details on rear)

I am a uniformed officer of Sussex Police based out of Crawley Police station on response.

On 15th JUNE 2019 I was on duty working a late turn shift from 1700 – 0400 hours and I was singled crewed in a marked police vehicle. At approximately 2332 hours I was asked to attend DÉJÀ VU in Crawley after reports of 8 travellers at the location becoming abusive towards staff.

I arrived on scene within a few minutes and spoke with the what I believe was the manager. He explained to me that there had been some form of altercation between a group of 8 travellers and another group inside the bar. It was then explained to me that the manager wanted to group of travellers to leave the location. I enquired with the manager whether this had been requested or not. The manager explained to me that it had not been. I then explained to the manager that they were required to do this before police got involved. The manager has then gone to do this.

After around 30 seconds two or three of the group came and spoke with myself. I would describe them as being intoxicated due to their breath smelling of intoxicating liquor, their speech was slurred and they were unsteady on their feet. I would say they were intoxicated however, not drunk. When the males spoke to me they were completely fine and were not causing any issues.

I have then been approached by the manager again whom explained to that there had been a miss understanding and the group of males would be staying at the bar. I have then explained to the manager that we cannot be called out to the bar to act as security for the rest of the night.

I have then stood other units down and had no further dealing with any involved parties.

This statement was made from my recollections of the night events. I am able to easily remember that night.

19th June 2019 23:28 hours

At 23:30 hours a 15 year old female entered Déjà vu in the company of another female. They proceeded to the bar where alcohol was purchased by the older girl for both of them. They remained on the premises until 01:52 during which time further drinks were purchased for both girls; by the older female and by some male patrons of the bar.

This incident subsequently came to the attention of Sussex Police via a family member concerned about the safety of the young & vulnerable female. (Full details cannot be provided in this document) PC Jones requested, and was provided with, CCTV footage of the incident by the premises staff. However upon viewing, it became apparent this was incomplete; an hour and a half was missing during the time the females remained on the premises. Following a second request the complete footage was provided. It is clear to see that at no time is the child asked to produce I.D. nor is any attempt made to prevent the proxy sale of alcohol for a child. No intervention, nor duty of care is apparent.

23rd June 02:46 hours

The South East Ambulance Service contacted Sussex Police to report of a male who had been involved in a fight within Déjà Vu. The male had been knocked unconscious with a bump to the head. Having regained consciousness the victim then left the scene and no further action was taken by the ambulance service. Police officers were not called to the assault by the premises staff.

Later that day (**23rd June 20:00 hours**) Pc Jones attended the premises and requested to see the CCTV footage from the assault at 02:46 hours. The footage showed people dancing on the dance floor. Following some interaction between the males, the suspect suddenly assaulted the victim, inflicting a number of blows to him, even after he has fallen to the floor. Shortly afterwards door supervisors appear and place the victim in the recovery position. The suspect was not detained and the police are not called; despite the victim losing consciousness. Ultimately the victim did not wish to engage with the police and the incident not progressed by investigating officers.

However Sussex Police are greatly concerned that a patron of the club sustained head injuries which could have been life changing. The impact of which may not have been immediately discernible. Yet no call was made to the police and no attempt was made to detain the suspect.

PC Jones raised these concerns with Mr. Samaroo, who stated that, as the victim did not want to report the matter they did not inform the police. It was explained that it is not appropriate for premises staff to decide which assaults they are going to report to the police.

While on the premises PC Jones explained to the DPS that it was a year since drug mapping was carried out at the club and offered to repeat the process. Mr. Samaroo agreed that this was a good idea.

Day Saturday 1118704 Date 22/06/19

Door Supervisors on Duty					
Name	Badge No.	Expiry Date	Time on	Time off	Signature
S. Palk	10140136 86417660	11/20	21:00	3:00	[Signature]
I. MAQUIDE	1018 7401 9446 7664	9/4/20	21:00		[Signature]
H. Wisniewski	10127209 94130137	07/20	21:00		[Signature]
T. SSENINDE	10100046 02634794	09/20	22:00	3:00	[Signature]

Fire Exit Check I confirm that all fire exits are clear and unobstructed by any obstacle

Time Checked	Initials	Time	Initials	Time	Initials
Start of Shift		22:30	[Signature]	01:30	[Signature]
20:00		23:00	[Signature]	02:00	[Signature]
20:30		23:30	[Signature]	02:30	[Signature]
21:00	[Signature]	00:00	[Signature]	03:00	
21:30	[Signature]	00:30	[Signature]	03:30	
22:00	[Signature]	01:00	[Signature]	04:00	

Capacity Check Log

Time	In	Out	Net	Time	In	Out	Net	Time	In	Out	Net
19:30				22:30	12	5	7	01:30	137	44	93
20:00				23:00	20	7	13	02:00	137	52	85
20:30				23:30	25	10	15	02:30	137	69	68
21:00	0	0	0	00:00	352	14	38	03:00			
21:30	5	5	0	00:30	104	19	85	03:30			
22:00	8	5	3	01:00	137	33	104	04:00			

Floor / Toilet Check Log Floor & Toilet Areas check for spillages / glass every day at the following times, and any hazards reported to Duty Manager for action.

Time	Initial	Time	Initial	Time	Initial
19:30		22:30	[Signature]	01:30	[Signature]
20:00		23:00	[Signature]	02:00	[Signature]
20:30		23:30	[Signature]	02:30	
21:00	[Signature]	00:00	[Signature]	03:00	
21:30	[Signature]	00:30	[Signature]	03:30	
22:00	[Signature]	01:00	[Signature]	04:00	

Enforcement Visit Log	Time of Visit	Details of Visit / Action Taken	AM Informed

All incidents must be recorded. Where an incident may lead to further action, for example an accident or injury to a customer or team member it is crucial that any Company incident reporting procedure is followed in full, that all relevant details are recorded, and CCTV retained at site to assist investigation.

Where there are no incidents on any date please ensure that the log clearly shows that this is the case and that it is not left blank

Time	Type of Incident	Details & Action Taken (Note if police / ambulance called)	Name / Badge No.	Signature	Reviewed
0130	ASSAULT	IC1 mate Assaulted another IC1 male - male who was Assaulted refused medical treatment + he Did not want Police called and he left the venue He 1st male also was Ejected out. [Redacted]	1018 9601 5746 7669	[Redacted]	✓

Refusals at door:

Drunk:

No I.D:

Daily Sign off - "I confirm all incidents have been recorded and all information is correct"

✓

Signature

Date

Head Doorman (if door team on duty)

25/6/18

Duty Manager